

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendments and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

After entry of this amendment, Claims 1-24 are pending, but Claims 1-9 and 13-14 have been withdrawn from further consideration by a previous response. Claims 10-12, 15, 17-24 are amended, and Claim 16 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is introduced.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; Claims 10, 12, 15-16 and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,274,887, hereafter "Yamazaki '887") in view of Yamazaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,765,549, hereafter "Yamazaki '549"); and Claims 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki '887 and Yamazaki '549 in further view of Miyazima (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0171086).

Initially, as Claim 16 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is rendered moot.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 10, 11, 15-16 and 18-24 as being unpatentable over Yamazaki '887 in view of Yamazaki '549, Claim 10 is amended to recite, *inter alia*, an EL display apparatus that includes:

a cathode supply line that applies a cathode voltage and is formed on the substrate and located under the source driver IC;

a common cathode line that is electrically connected to the cathode supply line and formed between the source driver IC and the display area; and

a cathode wiring that branches from the common cathode line and is configured to apply the cathode voltage to the pixels in the display area, *a potential of the cathode supply*

line being applied to both ends of the common cathode line, and a current being applied to the EL elements via the cathode wiring. (Emphasis added.)

These amendments find non-limiting support at least at paragraph [1449] of the specification as originally filed.

The primary reference, Yamazaki '887 generally describes a semiconductor device, such as an active matrix type liquid crystal display that includes thin film transistors (TFT).¹ In one embodiment, Yamazaki '887 describes that an EL device (507) is connected to a current supply line (5006) via a current-control TFT (5004), which is controlled by the switching TFTs (5002).² Yamazaki '887 also describes gate wiring (5003) and source wiring (5001) bias the TFTs (5002, 5004).³

However, Yamazaki '887 does not describe that both ends of current supply line (5006) are connected to either the gate wiring (5003) or the source wiring (5001). Instead, Yamazaki '887 illustrates no connection between the ends of the current supply line (5006) and the gate wiring (5003) or the source wiring (5001).⁴ In fact, Yamazaki 887 is silent as to how the ends of the current supply line (5006) are connected. Conversely, amended Claim 1 recites that a potential of the cathode supply line is applied to *both ends of the common cathode line*. Therefore, Yamazaki 887 fails to disclose the claimed common cathode line, and Yamazaki '549 does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, no combination of Yamazaki 887 and Yamazaki '549 describes every feature recited in amended Claim 1, and amended Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance together with any claim depending therefrom.

¹ Yamazaki '887 at column 1, lines 5-25.

² Yamazaki '887 at column 34, lines 29-37; see also Figure 29A.

³ Yamazaki '887 at column 34, lines 29-67.

⁴ See Figures 29A-29C of Yamazaki 887.

Moreover, amended Claim 15 recites features substantially similar to those recited in amended Claim 10, and is believed to be in condition for allowance, together with any claim depending therefrom, for substantially similar reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 10, 12, 15-16, 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

As all other rejections of record rely upon Yamazaki '887 for describing the above-distinguished features, and the above-distinguished features are not disclosed or suggested by Yamazaki 887, alone or in combination with any other art of record, it is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 11 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.


For the reasons discussed above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance for Claims 10-12, 15 and 17-24 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Aldo Martinez
Registration No. 61,357